



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,486	07/03/2003	Michael Mueller	7296-2	4437

7590 11/25/2005

STEVEN M GREENBERG
CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG P.A.
200 EAST LAS OLAS BOULEVARD
SUITE 2040
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301

EXAMINER

NOVOSAD, JENNIFER ELEANORE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3634

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/613,486	Applicant(s) MUELLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer E. Novosad	Art Unit 3634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2005 and 15 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the amendment filed August 17, 2005 by which claims 1-7 were amended and the Request for Continued Examination filed September 15, 2005.

Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 3 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In line 2 of each of claims 2 and 3, "comprises" should be changed to --comprise--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,284,258 (Genero et al. '258).

Genero et al. '258 disclose a stacking device (20 - see Figure 24) comprising top and bottom planar stacking surfaces comprising a polygon, i.e., rectangle, without holes (the portion in 109 is not considered to be part of the stacking device) having a configuration for supporting at least one article stacked on top of the top parallel planar stacking surface.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,276,984 (Simmons '984).

Art Unit: 3634

Simmons '984 discloses a stacking device (56) comprising top and bottom planar stacking surfaces comprising an ellipse (see Figure 5) without holes having a configuration for supporting *at least one article* (note that the article is 44) stacked on top of the top parallel planar stacking surface.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,161,158 (Lurey '158).

Lurey '158 discloses a stacking system (see Figure 2) comprising a plurality of stacking devices (16), each of the devices (16) comprising top and bottom parallel planar stacking surfaces without holes and having a configuration for supporting at least one article stacked on top of the top planar surface wherein at least two of the devices comprise differing surface areas for supporting articles of different sizes (see Figure 2 - right side thereof, whereby the element 16 in the middle of the figure, extends further past the top element 16, and thereby defines a larger area, i.e., a differing size.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Genero et al. '258, alone.

Genero et al. '258 disclose the device as advanced above.

Art Unit: 3634

The claim differs from Genero et al. '258 in requiring (a) the surfaces to comprise a machine washable material (claim 4), and (b) the surfaces to be configured for direct communication with a wire mesh shelf (claim 6).

With respect to (a), the device shown by Genero et al. '258 is fabricated from plastic. *Thus*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that plastic constitutes a machine washable material, thereby allowing moisture, dirt, etc. to be cleaned from the surfaces.

With respect to (b), although Genero et al. '258 do not show use with a wire mesh shelf, the structure of the device shown by Genero et al. '258 is considered to be capable of being used in such a way, thereby increasing storage capabilities and capacity.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims, filed August 17, 2005 and September 15, 2005, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer E. Novosad whose telephone number is 571-272-6832. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 5:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard E. Chilcot can be reached on 571-272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Jennifer E. Novosad
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3634

November 17, 2005